DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 212 PS 011 474

AUTHOR Poresky, Robert H.
TITLE Family Day Care Home Provider Training: Quality Factors and Final Project Report.
INSTITUTION Kansas State Univ., Manhattan. Dept. of Family and Child Development.
SPONS AGENCY Kansas State Dept. of Social and Rehabilitation Services, Topeka.; Kansas State Univ., Manhattan. Agricultural Experiment Station.
PUB DATE Apr 80
CONTRACT 80-394-A
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Child Caregivers; *Day Care; *Educational Quality; *Family Day Care; *Job Training; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of this report of the second phase of the Day Care Training System project was to train and support family day care home providers. The training was based on the second edition of "Caring for Children Today" (Poresky et al., 1979), with additional training for personnel of the Kansas State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) based on the "Manual for Trainers of Family Day Care Providers" (Poresky et al., 1979). The report reviews the training and its effectiveness as reflected by the amount and quality of the training provided between October, 1978, and December 1979. The contract called for 380 hours of training; 385 hours were provided, including training for day care providers and SRS personnel. The training provided more than 1700 person-sessions for family day care providers and interested individuals, as well as 51 other person-sessions for SRS workers in family day care training. The enrollment figures came from 123 training sessions and two SRS staff-training sessions. Participant evaluations of the sessions were extremely positive with a mean rating of 2.9 on a 3-point scale. (Author/MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190212

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Family Day Care Home Provider Training: Quality Factors and Final Project Report[1]

Robert H. Poresky, Ph.D.

Kansas State University

April 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert H. Poresky
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Department of Family and Child Development

Manhattan, Kansas

PS011474

[1] Preparation of this paper was supported in part by the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station, contribution #80-394-A, Department of Family and Child Development, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, 66506 and in part on a contractual basis by the Kansas State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services.

Overview

The primary objective of the second phase of the Day Care Training System project was to train and support family day care home providers. The training was based on the second edition of Caring for Children Today (Poresky et al., 1979b), with additional training for personnel of the Kansas State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (S.R.S.) based on the Manual for Trainers of Family Day Care Providers (Poresky et al., 1979a).

This report reviews the training and its effectiveness as reflected by the amount and quality of the training provided between October, 1978, and December 1979. The contract called for 380 hours of training; 385 hours were provided, including training for day care providers and S.R.S. personnel. The training provided more than 1700 person-sessions for family day care providers and interested individuals, as well as 51 other person-sessions for S.R.S. workers in family day care training. The enrollment figures came from 123 training sessions and two S.R.S. staff-training sessions. Participant evaluations of the sessions were extremely positive with a mean rating of 2.9 on a 3-point scale.

Training Content

The training content was determined by assessing needs in the first phase of the Day Care Training System in 1978 (Poresky and Driggers, 1978). Based on the needs assessment analysis of feedback from providers and state agency personnel, ten primary topics were defined:

1. Deciding - Is It For Me? The first section of the guide clarifies reasons a family member might want to provide child care. Outlined in this section are the responsibilities of day care providers and how the provider's family is involved. Information given concerns zoning requirements, types of physical facilities needed, and how to use existing space in the home.
2. Getting Prepared and Organized. Section two examines the functions of family day care providers and emphasizes the uniqueness of the family day care home environment. The day care provider is made aware of management factors in operating a day care home. Efficient recordkeeping and the need to organize equipment and play materials are stressed. The importance of schedules for both the child and the day care provider also is dealt with.
3. Understanding Children. An overview of characteristics of a developing child is presented, assuming that knowledge of basic child development concepts may alleviate misunderstandings between a child and the day care provider. Toilet training is included in section three.
4. Keeping Your Children Safe. The information in this section is to inform and remind providers about potential hazards in the home. Child-proofing the home and yard are safety measures to be used by family day care providers. The provider is also reminded to inspect equipment and toys used by the children. Finally, this section focuses on the need to have established emergency and first aid procedures in a day care home.

5. Developing a Health Program. This section gives information on isolating ill children, administering medication, and observing them closely to insure their well-being. Keeping health records on each child as part of the family day care provider's responsibility is covered in section five.

6. Providing Nutritious Food. The material in section six should make providers aware of how important nutritious meals and snacks are to children. The social aspects of meal time, menu planning, and food storage are examined in this section. Activities involving children and nutrition are included.

7. Helping Children Grow and Learn. Guidelines for selecting toys and equipment appropriate to the age of children cared for, and suggested activities for young children are covered in section seven, which is divided into three parts: activities and play things for infants, activities and play materials for preschoolers, and activities and play mediums for school-age children.

8. Discipline and Guidance. Alternative methods of adult-child interaction are outlined in section eight, with additional information to help providers avoid behavior problems and to set limits before problems arise.

9. Recognizing and Handling Child Abuse and Neglect. Characteristics of abused/neglected children and abusive adults are useful information for family day care personnel. What to look for, whom to report abuse cases to, and necessary action by providers is dealt with in this section.

10. Working With Parents. The final chapter emphasizes two-way communication between parents and providers and stresses reviewing with parents the regulations, enrollment procedures, fees, and schedules before taking a child into a day care home -- a key to successful parent/provider communication.

A project training package has been developed for each of the ten sections. It includes announcements, objectives, agendas, handouts, audio-visual media, illustrative materials, evaluations, and equipment that have been effective in presenting the subject matter of the sections. In addition a Manual for Trainers of Family Day Care Providers by Poresky, Driggers, Diehl, and Ytell (1979a) has been compiled for use in family day care provider training.

The Manual's introduction reviews information generally appropriate for leaders of training sessions, documents in-service training, and how to get documentation and evaluative information that the Kansas State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (S.R.S.) requires. Individual sections of the Manual follow the S.R.S. training format including specific objectives, course content, and methods and materials for each section. The Manual's appendix includes training session agenda, handouts, discussion questions, supplemental audio-visual lists and a supplemental reading list for trainers and trainees.

Sessions, Hours, Participants, and Quality of Training Provided

More than 1800 participants received 385 hours of in-service training. The distribution of the 125 training sessions across ten primary topics is shown in Table 1, which also shows some combination sessions, an experimental toddler session, and training sessions required for selected staff by the Kansas State Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services. Table 1 data summarizes the training session participation for the entire state provided by the project. More detailed analyses of training sessions, training hours, and number of participants by topic and S.R.S. area are given in Appendix tables A, B, and C.

The quality of training estimate is from the participants' responses on the training session evaluation form to the question, "Was the session of practical value to you?" (see Appendix, SD: 205). The responses "No," "?," or "Yes," were transformed to 1, 2, and 3 values respectively for the analysis. The 2.9 quality estimate came from about 1200 responses by participants.

The grand mean of 2.92 on the three-point scale, or 97% of the maximum score, indicates clearly that participants valued the training sessions highly.

Table 1

Family Day Care Provider Training Sessions, Hours, Participants and Quality by Training Session Topic

Topic	Sessions (number)	Training hours (number)	Participants (number)	Quality* (average)
1. Deciding: Is It For You?	1	3	9	2.94
2. Getting Prepared and Organized	10	28	166	2.87
3. Understanding Children	17	47.5	337	2.95
4. Keeping Your Children Safe	6	17	78	2.91
5. Developing a Health Program	4	11	39	2.93
6. Providing Nutritious Food	13	38.5	116	2.89
7. Helping Children Grow and Learn	21	61.5	287	2.97
8. Discipline and Guidance	24	71	366	2.88
9. Child Abuse and Neglect	6	17	112	2.91
10. Working With Parents	17	51	215	2.93
11. Combination of #1 and #2	3	4.5	48	2.91
12. Toddler Care (experimental)	1	3	13	----
13. S.R.S. Staff Sessions	2	32	51	----
TOTALS	125	385	1,837	2.92 = Grand Mean

* Maximum score = 3.0

All topics included in the training sessions were evaluated as nearly perfect; lowest mean was 2.87 or 96%. The contract specified 118 day care workshops, and 125 were provided by the project; 380 hours were specified and 385 hours of in-service training were provided.

A one-way analysis of variance of the quality scores showed that mean evaluations did not vary by topic ($F=1.08$, $p=.38$). However, "Getting Prepared and Organized" and "Discipline and Guidance" workshops received lower ratings than the top rated "Understanding Children" and "Helping Children Grow and Learn" training sessions, but the differences were not statistically significant. The first two named may benefit from minor revision to make their practical value more apparent to participants.

During the project, five persons led training sessions with each rated by at least thirteen day care providers. The statistical analysis showed no significant differences in rated quality among the five who led training sessions.

How the training sessions were distributed across the 17 S.R.S. administrative areas in Kansas is shown in Table 2. The number of training sessions provided depended on the number of requests and ability to schedule the training sessions. Each area got at least five training sessions, with an average of 7.24. The maximum of 10 in the Topeka area came in 1½ hour sessions rather than the regular 3 hour sessions. The number of training hours also depended on the requests from each S.R.S. area. Training hours ranged from 15 to 26.5, averaging 20.76. The number of participants among the S.R.S. areas ranged from 322 in the Topeka

area to 56 and 54 in Pittsburg and Hiawatha areas, respectively. The average was 105 participants per area and 14½ per training session for the family day care providers. Evaluations of the quality of training did not differ among areas.

Table 2

Family Day Care Provider Training Session, Hours, Participants and Quality by S.R.S. Administrative Area in Kansas

S.R.S. AREA	Training sessions (number)	Training hours (number)	Participants (number)	Quality*
1. Chanute	7	21	67	2.89
2. Emporia	5	15	69	2.89
3. Garden City	5	15	60	2.90
4. Hays	8	23	47	2.94
5. Hiawatha	8	24	54	2.91
6. Hutchinson	8	22	98	2.98
7. Junction City	7	21	143	2.92
8. Kansas City	7	21	67	3.00
9. Olathe	8	24	65	2.96
10. Osawatomie	6	18	142	2.93
11. Parsons	5	15	105	2.92
12. Pittsburg	7	21	56	2.85
13. Pratt	9	27	86	2.94
14. Salina	9	26.5	120	2.88
15. Topeka	10	17.5	322	2.89
16. Wichita	7	21	217	2.91
17. Winfield	7	21	68	2.98
-- S.R.S. Staff	2	32	51	2.98
TOTALS	125	385	1,837	MEAN: 2.92

* Maximum score = 3.0

Factors Associated with Training Session Quality

The Training Session evaluation (form SD:205) gathers data regarding perceived quality of the training sessions. Factors that may be related to ratings by day care providers are divided into three sections: participant, instructor, and situation. These analyses, although generally based on one-way analysis of variance, are correlational rather than experimental. Although many of the findings appear to be causal, they measure covariation or association.

The distribution of responses from the almost 1400 participants regarding the quality of the training sessions to the question, "Was the session of practical value to you?" is given in Table 3.

Table 3

Training Session Distribution of Quality Responses

Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Yes	1,292	94
?	56	4
No	30	2
Total	1,378	100

The responses were overwhelmingly positive.

A. Participant Elements

Training session participants were asked why they attended the specific training session (question #1 on evaluation form SD:205), with two

answers provided: "personal interest" and "licensing requirement." Some checked both reasons; 30.5% checked "personal interest," 32.3% checked "licensing requirement," and 37.2% checked both.

Comparing the two variables by a one-way analysis showed that those who checked "licensing requirement" rated the sessions less highly than those who checked "personal interest" or both responses (see Table 4). The difference was highly significant ($F=19.1$, $p < 0.001$).

Table 4

Quality of Training Sessions Related to Reason for Attendance

Reason for Attending	Participants: Number	Percent	Quality*
Licensing requirement	443	32.3	2.83
Personal interest	419	30.5	2.96
Both	510	37.2	2.95
Totals	1,372	100.0	Mean: 2.91

* Maximum score = 3.0, F = 19.1, df = 2/1369, sig. p. < .001.

The question, "What did you want to get from the session?" showed that 95 percent wanted information. Responses were coded as respondents wanting training hours, general information, specific information, or support. Again, analysis of variance showed that the group who said they

attended for training hours rated the sessions less highly than those who attended for support or information (see Table 5). Again the difference was highly significant ($F=10.58$, $p < 0.001$).

Table 5

Training Session Quality as a Function of Expectation

Expectation	Participants: Number	Percent	Quality*
Training hours	27	2	2.63
General information	570	47	2.94
Specific topic information	597	48	2.95
Support	31	3	2.87
Total	1,225	100	Mean: 2.94

* Maximum score = 3.0, $F=10.58$, $df = 3/1221$, sig. $p. < .001$.

The SD:205 training session evaluation form next asked about the type of participation. Participants were asked to check whether their participation in the session was "positive," "passive," or "negative." Eighty-four percent described responded "positive," one percent "negative." As expected, "positive" participants were more highly satisfied with the quality of the training sessions than passive or negative participants (see Table 6).

Table 6

Training Session Quality as a Function of Participation

Participation	Participants Number	Percent	Quality*
Positive	1,089	84	2.96
Passive	194	15	2.74
Negative	17	1	2.59
Total	1,300	100	Mean: 2.92

* Maximum score = 3.0. F=45.35, df=2/1297, sig. p. < .001.

A supporting open-ended question asked participants to list one item they learned in the session; 94 percent gave a topic-relevant response; 3 percent, a general response and 3 percent, a feeling of support. These results support the "practical value" of the training sessions. Those who gave a response relevant to the training topic also rated the session higher than those who gave an unrelated answer, with those indicating emotional support intermediate (sig., F=9.31, p. < .001).

"Participant" elements show a consistent pattern. Those who were personally interested, expected to learn, and were active "positive" participants said the training sessions were of more practical value to them. Since such data are correlational, it is not certain whether or not predispositions of the participants "caused" them to benefit more from the training. But the data suggests elements in the recruiting and training that would increase the value of the in-service training to families that

provide day care in their homes. Because even those who said they attended because it was a licensing requirement rated the training sessions as practical (2.83 on the 3.0 scale, 94%), stressing training objectives in announcements of workshops seems logical. Mutual support also was associated with higher ratings, as was "positive" participation. Responses to the request for an item learned in the session are consistent with the above recommendation as those who gave relevant answers were those who gave higher practical value ratings.

B. Instructor Elements

The next series of items refers to the instructor's functioning in the training sessions. Ninety-nine percent of the participants felt that the instructor showed personal concern for individual problems or comments but stayed with the subject matter of the training session. Ninety-eight percent felt the material was well organized and ninety-nine percent, the instructor was enthusiastic about the subject matter. One-hundred percent (1,293 of 1,298) checked "YES" for the item indicating that the instructor accepted participant input during the session. These results clearly indicate strong instructors provided the training sessions under the Day Care Training System Project, Phase Two.

C. Situation Elements

Three items that asked about the training situation may provide useful information for future planning: length of the session and appropriateness of facility.

Table 7

Training Session Quality as a Function of Length of Session

Question	Responses, % "Yes"	"No"	Number of responses
Was the session too long?	12	88	1,280
Was the session too short?	5	95	932

Those who said the session was not too long rated the session as higher quality, of more practical value, than those who said it was too long, with the mean group ratings of 2.94 and 2.73 respectively (sig., F=53.54, p. < .001).

The three-hour training session appears both to work well and be well accepted.

Ninety-seven percent said the facilities (meeting rooms in S.R.S. offices, churches, banks, community buildings) were appropriate and three percent disagreed. Responses were related to the rated quality of the training sessions as tabulated below.

Table 8

Training Session Quality as a Function of Appropriateness of the Facility

Response to question, "facility appropriate?"	Participants Number	Percent	Quality*
Yes	1,237	97	2.92
?	7	0	2.86
No	33	3	2.70
Total	1,277	100%	Mean: 2.91

* Maximum score = 3.0. F=6.58, df=2/1274, sig. p. < .001.

Audio-visual materials and equipment are used in the training sessions. Ninety-seven percent said the materials and equipment worked properly and fit in with the subject. There was no signigicant difference in the related quality of sessions between those who checked, "Yes" and those who checked "No" about the use of audio-visual equipment.

Session Weaknesses

A wide variety of responses were obtained in response to the question, "What do you consider the weakness of the session?" The most frequent responses from 637 participants are tabulated below.

Table 9

Response	Participants Number	Percent	Quality*
No weakness	424	67	2.97
Too short	42	7	2.96
Too much participation	24	4	2.88
Too little information	22	3	2.86
Too little participation	39	6	2.85
Too long	23	4	2.65

* Maximum score = 3.0. F=4.46, sig. p. < .001.

The 424 participants who wrote in "no weakness" were surprisingly positive to the training session and the extra effort they made. The few who said the session was too short were balanced by those who said it was too long, and those who were critical of too much participation were balanced by those who said there was too little participation.

Program Interests

More than 1,000 participants indicated which part of the program interested them the most, as tabulated below.

Table 10

Most Interesting Part of the Programs

Most interesting part	Participants Number	Percent
Discussion, participation	328	33
All of it	266	27
Specific topic of session	182	18
Audio-visual materials	78	8
Examples used in training	38	4
Sharing knowledge	29	3
Making things	22	2

The most frequent responses focused on active participation including discussion, sharing knowledge, and making things which together account for 38 percent of the responses regarding "most interesting" part of the training. "All of it" type responses accounted for an additional 27 percent and audio-visual materials were cited by 8 percent of the participants. These results are consistent with the strong positive response to the training sessions and support including a variety of techniques in a training session to enlist the interest of as many participants as possible.

The active nature of a large percentage of the "most interesting part" responses supports the emphasis on involving participants rather than "lecturing" only.

Suggestions from 190 participants for future workshops regarded primarily content currently included in the Day Care Training System. The most common response not now included was the suggestion for more information about handicapped children or those with special needs (4% of those responding). First Aid, generally available through the Red Cross, was listed by four individuals. Seven requested more materials and the remainder were scattered throughout a variety of individual requests as tabulated below.

Table 11

Suggestions for Future Workshops

Suggestions	Number of Responses
Developing a Health Program	62
Deciding: Is It for You?	22
Helping Children Grow and Learn	14
Working with Parents	11
Discipline and Guidance	10
Getting Prepared and Organized	7
Handicapped Children and Those with Special Needs	7
More Materials	7
Understanding Children	6
Keeping Your Children Safe	6
Providing Nutritious Food	6

Table 11 Continued

Suggestions	Number of Responses
First Aid	4
More Audio-visual Materials	4
Child Abuse and Neglect	2

Form SD:205P

During the last two months of the project, we were instructed by S.R.S. to use form SD:205P for training session evaluations. This section reports the results from form SD:205P by 123 participants. Ninety-nine percent checked "Yes" to "Was the time spent in training a good use of your time?" Such a high "Yes" response precludes using total responses as an overall "quality" estimate for lack of variance. Of the 105 who responded to "What did you pick up that is important to your service delivery?" Nineteen percent gave a general response; 43%, a topic-specific response; and 38% a relevant but not specific response.

The participants were also asked to use a 5-point scale to respond to "Do you feel that the information was presented in a practical manner?" with 1 = most practical to 5 = very theoretical, which was the closest to an overall quality estimate. Fifty-nine percent of the 120 who responded circled "1"; 20% circled "2"; 9%, "3"; 5%, "4"; and 7%, "5" for a 1.80 average.

Asked to list a specific idea they plan to implement within the next week, 63% gave a relevant response; 30%, a topic-specific response; and 7%, a general response. There was no indication of an association

between this question and the "practical manner" quality estimate.

The final evaluative question, "Would you attend another session by this trainer?" all but one of the 123 participants checked "Yes". The other one was "Undecided". As with the earlier form, the responses to form SD:205P indicate a clearly successful training program well accepted by its intended target population.

Training Sessions for S.R.S. Personnel

The Day Care Training System provided two training sessions for S.R.S. personnel. The more complete training session evaluation form (SD:205) was used with both sessions. Sixty-five evaluations were analyzed covering the two training sessions.

The two-day session involved training for those who provide family day care. The first session covered some of the major sections of the training system and theoretical and empirical bases for training material content. It also focused on procedures for successfully coordinating the training sessions in each S.R.S. area.

The second training session, a follow-up, was intended to build on the first and on experience the S.R.S. staff had from working with the training system after the first session. The second session included more content and background orientation on the wide range of Day Care Training System materials and an experiental component leading a short session with video-tape feedback. The effectiveness of these training sessions for S.R.S. staff is reflected by responses to "Was the session

of practical value to you?": 91% answered "Yes;" 9%, "?;" with none answering "No," for a mean response of 2.91 on the 3-point scale. An analysis of the evaluations by the 65 participants follows.

Participant Elements

The participants in these training sessions were there because of "personal interest" (48%), to meet a requirement (28%), and for both reasons (25%). All indicated a desire for information as what they wanted from the training sessions. During the sessions they received the guide, Caring for Children Today: A Guide for Family Day Care Providers (Poresky et al., 1979b), and the Manual for Trainers of Family Day Care Providers (Poresky et al., 1979a). The Manual is coordinated with the Guide and with the materials developed by the project. The staff described their participation in the sessions as "positive" (80%) and passive (20%) with none indicating "negative". All listed a relevant point as the "item" they learned in the training session.

Instructor Elements

All participants indicated on the evaluation form that presenters showed "personal concern for individual problems or comments." Regarding organization of the material, 97% checked "Yes." All the respondents checked "Yes" to the question about instructors' enthusiasm for the training session subject matter, and 97% said that instructors accepted input from respondents.

Situation Elements

Regarding the length of the S.R.S. training sessions, two six-hour

days for each, 83% said it was not too long, and 97% said it was not too short; 93% said the facility was appropriate and 7% said it was not, the reason given as being too cold (8 participants). The use of audio-visual equipment was highly rated with 98% checking "Yes" regarding its proper use and fit with the subject.

The most frequent answer to the open-ended question about session weaknesses was "none" (55%), followed by "too much information," (12%) and "too long" (9%). Parts of the program that interested the staff the most were presenters (28%), followed by "all of it" (24%), discussion opportunities (20%). Only seven staff gave suggestions for future workshops and four said they wanted more training sessions.

Judging from the situation elements, the S.R.S. staff training sessions were well organized and appropriate to the needs of those attending, except for being a bit too long for a few, but most (83%) said the length was appropriate. The facility, audio-visual equipment, and planning for these training sessions were rated excellent by those who attended.

Summary and Recommendations for Future Family Day Care Home Provider Training

The primary objective specified in the contract for Phase Two of the Day Care Training System was 380 hours of in-service training to those who provide family day care and to Social and Rehabilitation Services (S.R.S.) personnel in Kansas. The objective was exceeded with 385 hours of training, providing more than 1800 sessions during October,

1978, through December, 1979. Participant evaluations of the training sessions were extremely positive with a mean rating of 2.92 with a 3.00 maximum rating.

Caring for Children Today - A guide for Family Day Care Providers was revised in Phase Two and reprinted in October, 1979. During this second phase the Manual for Trainers of Family Day Care Providers was prepared by project staff for the S.R.S. training workshop in July, 1979. The two publications are fully coordinated to facilitate the delivery of family day care home provider training by project staff, qualified S.R.S. staff, and consultants.

Evaluations were requested from training session participants in the 125 training sessions covering the ten primary session topics and the S.R.S. staff training. The mean evaluations on the 3.00 scale ranged from 2.87 through 2.97 with no statistically significant differences between these excellent ratings. Sessions were provided in all 17 S.R.S. administrative areas of Kansas. The number of sessions during the fourteen-month Phase Two project ranged from five to ten with a mean of 7.2 per area or about six per year. All training session leaders received very high ratings with no statistically significant differences among them.

A number of factors were associated with rated program quality as measured by the participants' response to "Was the session of practical value to you?" on the S.R.S. Training Session Evaluation (Form SD:205).

Factors associated with rated training quality included 1) attending session for "personal interest" to gain information rather than training hours and 2) actively participating in the training session. So in recruiting participants for future training project, emphasis should be given to eliciting providers' personal interest and active participation in the training by accentuating the importance of professional development rather than accumulation of training hours.

Highly rated instructor elements included personal concern for providers' comments and acceptance of participant input. The participants reported the training to be very well organized and the leaders enthusiastic about the sessions.

Situational elements included responses to the length of the typically three-hour training sessions, which were about right for 88 to 95% of the respondents. All but 3% reported the facilities arranged by local S.R.S. personnel to be appropriate.

The facilities often were meeting rooms in S.R.S. locations and meeting rooms provided without charge by banks and other community institutions.

Audio-visual compoments of the training sessions were well received and rated as fitting with the training session subject; 67% of the respondents reported "no weakness" in the sessions. A few said they were too short. Discussion and participation were cited by 33% of the respondents as the most interesting part of the sessions. "All of it" was the second most frequent response.

The above discussion is based on statistical analyses of the longer SD:205 form. A shorter six-item form, used the last two months of the project, provided less information for assessing the training sessions.

These results strongly support training sessions for family day care home providers in Kansas. The training was extremely well received as presented by prepared session leaders using carefully developed materials. Six training sessions per year per S.R.S. area appear to be appropriate and available facilities for the sessions adequate.

Reference Notes

Poresky, R. H. & Driggers, J. M. Child care training needs assessment. Educational Resources Information Center, ED 156 324, 1978.

Poresky, R. H., Driggers, J., Diehl, S., & Ytell, E. Manual for trainers of family day care providers. Day Care Training System Project, Department of Family and Child Devleopment, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, July 1979a.

Poresky, R. H., Driggers, J., Diehl, S., Bunge, J., & Ytell, E. Caring for children today: A guide for family day care providers. Day Care Training System Project, Department of Family and Child Development, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, October 1979b.

APPENDIX

Contents

1. Table A. Number of Training Hours by S.R.S. Area and Topic
2. Table B. Number of Training Sessions by S.R.S. Area and Topic
3. Table C. Number of Participants by S.R.S. Area and Topic
4. Training Session Evaluation (Form SD:205)
5. Evaluation of Contract Training (Form SD:205p)
6. Training Session Evaluation Analysis Code Book

TABLE A
NUMBER OF TRAINING HOURS
by S.R.S. AREA and TOPIC

	Chanute	Emporia	Garden City	Hays	Hiawatha	Hutchinson	Junction City	Kansas City	Olathe	Osawatomie	Parsons	Pittsburg	Pratt	Salina	Topeka	Wichita	Winfield	SRS Staff	TOTAL
1. Deciding: Is It For You?		3																	3
2. Getting Prepared and Organized	3	3		2.5				3	3				3	6	1.5		3		28
3. Understanding Children				6	3	5	3	3	3	3	3		3	3	3.5	9			47.5
4. Keeping Your Children Safe						3		3			3	3			2	3			17
5. Developing A Health Program					3				3						2		3		11
6. Providing Nutritious Food	3			5.5			3		3			6	6	6		3	3		38.5
7. Helping Children Grow & Learn	3	3	6	3	6	6	6		3	6		3	6	5.5			6		61.5
8. Discipline and Guidance	6	3	6	6	6	5	6	3	3	3	3	6	6		2	3	3		71
9. Recognizing & Handling Child Abuse and Neglect		3			6				3	3					2				17
10. Working With Parents	6		3			3	3	9	3	3	3	3	3	6		3	3		51
11. Combination #1 & #2															4.5				4.5
12. Toddler Care											3								3
13. SRS Workshop																		32	32
TOTAL	21	15	15	23	24	22	21	21	24	18	15	21	27	26.5	17.5	21	21	32	385

TABLE B
NUMBER OF TRAINING SESSIONS
by S.R.S. AREA and TOPIC

	Chanute	Emporia	Garden City	Hays	Hiawatha	Hutchinson	Junction City	Kansas City	Olathe	Osawatomie	Parsons	Pittsburg	Pratt	Salina	Topeka	Wichita	Winfield	SRS Staff	TOTAL
1. Deciding: Is It For You?		1																	1
2. Getting Prepared and Organized	1	1		1				1	1				1	2	1		1		10
3. Understanding Children				2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	2	3			17
4. Keeping Your Children Safe						1		1			1	1			1	1			6
5. Developing A Health Program					1				1						1		1		4
6. Providing Nutritious Food	1			2			1		1			2	2	2		1	1		13
7. Helping Children Grow & Learn	1	1	2	1	2	2	2		1	2		1	2	2			2		21
8. Discipline and Guidance	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2		1	1	1		24
9. Recognizing & Handling Child Abuse & Neglect		1			2				1	1					1				6
10. Working With Parents	2		1			1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	2		1	1		17
11. Combination #1 & #2															3				3
12. Toddler Care											1								1
13. SRS Workshop																		2	2
TOTAL	7	5	5	8	8	8	7	7	8	6	5	7	9	9	10	7	7	2	125

TABLE C
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
by S.R.S. AREA and TOPIC

	Chanute	Emporia	Garden City	Hays	Hiawatha	Hutchinson	Junction City	Kansas City	Olathe	Osawatomie	Parsons	Pittsburg	Pratt	Salina	Topeka	Wichita	Winfield	SRS Staff	TOTAL
1. Deciding: Is It For You?		9																	9
2. Getting Prepared and Organized	10	20		14				12	5				5	41	46		13		166
3. Understanding Children				9	3	27	18	9	3	38	40		10	5	78	97			337
4. Keeping Your Children Safe						0		3			10	4			43	18			78
5. Developing A Health Program					5				12						10		12		39
6. Providing Nutritious Food	5			10			14		7			13	8	12		34	13		116
7. Helping Children Grow & Learn	9	11	41	6	17	34	44		10	40		6	24	34			11		287
8. Discipline and Guidance	27	22	16	8	10	24	52	21	15	21	10	25	27		44	30	14		366
9. Recognizing & Handling Child Abuse & Neglect		7			19				12	21					53				112
10. Working With Parents	16		3			13	15	22	1	22	32	8	12	28		38	5		215
11. Combination #1 & #2															48				48
12. Toddler Care											13								13
13. SRS Workshop																		51	51
TOTAL	67	69	60	47	54	98	143	67	65	142	105	56	86	120	322	217	68	51	1837

Title_____ Date_____

Leader_____ Place_____

Your input is needed in order to improve the Day Care Training Project. Please check those remarks which most accurately convey your rating of the teaching - learning process.

Participant

1. Why did you come to the session? Personal interest____ Licensing requirement ____

2. What did you want to get from the session?

3. Describe your participation in the session. Positive___ Passive____Negative ____
Comments:

4. Was the session of practical value to you? Yes____ ? ____ No____
Comments.

5. List one item you learned in this session.

Instructor

6. Did the presenter show personal concern for individual problems or comments yet stick to subject matter? yes_____ No_____ Comments:

7. Did you consider the material well organized? Yes____ ? ____ No____
Comments:

8. Was the instructor enthusiastic about the subject matter? Yes____ ? _____
No____ Comments:

9. Did he/she accept participant input? Yes____ ? ____ No____ Comments:

Situation

10. Was the session too long? Yes____ No____
Was the session too short? Yes____ No____

11. Was the facility used for the workshop appropriate? Yes_____ No_____

12. If audio-visual equipment was used, did it work properly and fit in with the subject? Yes_____ No_____

13. What do you consider the weakness of the session?

14. What part of the program interested you the most?

15. What are your suggestions for future workshops?

16. Additional comments:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SD:205P
10/79

EVALUATION OF CONTRACT TRAINING

WORKSHOP TITLE _____ TRAINER _____

LOCATION _____ DATE _____

1. WAS THE TIME SPENT IN TRAINING A GOOD USE OF YOUR TIME?

   YES ____ NO ____ UNSURE ____

2. WHAT DID YOU PICK UP THAT IS IMPORTANT TO YOUR SERVICE DELIVERY?

3. LIST AT LEAST ONE SPECIFIC IDEA WHICH YOU PLAN TO IMPLEMENT WITHIN THE NEXT WEEK?

4. DO YOU FEEL THAT THE INFORMATION WAS PRESENTED IN A PRACTICAL MANNER? (Circle Number)

   Most Practical Very Theoretical

   1 2 3 4 5

5. WHAT WOULD YOU RECOMMEND TO MAKE THIS SESSION MORE USEFUL TO YOU?

6. WOULD YOU ATTEND ANOTHER SESSION BY THIS TRAINER?

   YES ____ NO ____ UNDECIDED ____

   Comments: